

<b>AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT</b>		1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES 1   25
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. <b>PR-HQ-05-12521/0001</b>	3. EFFECTIVE DATE <b>02/09/06</b>	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. <b>PR-HQ-05-12521</b>	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY CODE <b>Environmental Protection Agency Bid and Proposal Room, Ariel Rios Building (3802R) 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20460</b>		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) CODE	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)		(✓)	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. <b>PR-HQ-05-12521</b>
		✓	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11)
			10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.
			10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)
CODE	FACILITY CODE		

**11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS**

☒ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers ☐ is extended, ☒ is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:

(a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning 1 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

**12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)****13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.**

(✓)	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A
	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
	D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor ☐ is not, ☐ is required to sign this document and return \_\_\_\_\_ copies to the issuing office.

**14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)**

The purpose of this amendment is to:

- 1) Add clause 52.237-3, Continuity of Services (JAN 1991)
- 2) Add Attachment 17, "Questions and Answers #1, dated 02/09/2006". This Questions and Answers document addresses questions submitted to the Government on or before January 25, 2006.
- 3) Correct minor syntax errors throughout the document
- 4) Revise Provision M.5, "Evaluation Factors for Award". Potential offerors should pay particular attention to revisions to the weighting and organization structure under Sub-factor 1.A "Technical and Functional Evaluation" and Subfactor 1.C "Management Approach"
- 5) Revise Attachment 5 to: (a) include changes identified in Attachment 17, (b) correct the clause reference under 1.2.3, Tab C, and (c) insert the following language in 1.3.5 "Solution Demonstrations", "Offerors may provide supporting materials for the solution demonstration not to exceed ten (10) pages per topic area. The supporting materials will be considered for reference only, and will not be evaluated. Offerors shall provide eleven (11) copies of any supporting materials submitted."

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print) <b>YVONNE D. STISO</b>	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR  (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  (Signature of Contracting Officer)	16C. DATE SIGNED

NSN 7540-01-152-8070  
PREVIOUS EDITION UNUSABLE

30-105

STANDARD FORM 30 (REV 10-83)  
Prescribed by GSA  
FAR (48 CFR) 52.243

**AMENDMENTS TO THE SOLICITATION**

1. The Section I clause entitled "CONTINUITY OF SERVICES (FAR 52.237-3) (JAN 1991)" has been added. It has been incorporated by reference.

2. The Section L clause entitled "SUBCONTRACTING PROGRAM PLAN FOR UTILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS AND SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS CONCERNS (EP 52.219-125) (AUG 1984)" has been modified. The text is as follows:

As part of the initial offer, offerors shall submit a subcontracting plan as called for by FAR 52.219-9. The Offeror shall provide its Subcontracting Plan in Volume 6. For Public Offerors, submit your agency's subcontracting goals and describe how your proposed subcontracting plan meets your agency's goals.

3. The Section M clause entitled "EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD (EPAAR 1552.215-71) (AUG 1999)" has been modified. The text is as follows:

(a) The Government will make award to the responsible offeror(s) whose offer conforms to the solicitation and is most advantageous to the Government cost or other factors considered. For this solicitation, all evaluation factors other than cost or price when combined are significantly more important than cost or price.

(b) Evaluation factors and significant subfactors to determine quality of product or service:

**Minimum Qualifications Matrix**

The Minimum Qualifications Matrix will be evaluated on a **pass/fail basis**, as set forth in the provision entitled "MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS MATRIX". Offers which do not receive a rating of "pass" under this criterion are not eligible for award.

**Factor 1 - Technical Merit****375 Points****Sub-Factor 1.A. - Technical and Functional Evaluation****225 Points**

Under Sub-Factor 1.A, the proposed Software Solution is of relatively greater weight than implementation or hosting. Implementation and hosting are of equal weight.

For the proposed Software Solution, the evaluation areas described in the first two (2) bullets below are each more important than any of the other remaining individual bullets under Software Solution. EPA will evaluate:

- The Offeror's thoroughness and rationale to support the recommended software solution and its components;
- The degree to which the Offeror's solution complies with the requirements specified in the Requirements Response Matrices;

- The Offeror's demonstrated understanding of EPA's FSMP objectives and business and technical environment from a functional perspective;
- The degree to which the proposed solution can accommodate future requirements;
- The efficiency and effectiveness of the Offeror's release management approach for the proposed software, to determine product stability;
- The Offeror's commitment to the federal market and e-Government initiatives; (i.e., provides adapters to CCR, e-Travel, etc., sponsors user support groups, describes portion of budget applied to research and development activities);
- The ability of the proposed solution to fit within EPA Enterprise Architecture (refer to the CONOPs for further information on EPA Enterprise Architecture);
- The completeness and appropriateness of the portion of the Offeror's risk management plan applicable to the proposed software solution; and
- The validity and reasonableness of the Offeror's software solution assumptions.

For Implementation, the evaluation areas described in the first five (5) bullets are each more important than any of the other remaining individual bullets listed under Implementation.

EPA will evaluate:

- Elements of the offeror's proposed Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) related to implementation. The QASP will be evaluated based on the following criteria;
  - Offeror's identification of meaningful, applicable performance standards that address EPA objectives;
  - The reasonableness of the Offeror's Acceptable Quality levels and the likelihood that they will provide incentive for the successful offeror to perform at a high level;
  - The reasonableness of the Offeror's proposed monitoring methods, including verifiability of the measures by EPA and a recommended approach that minimizes the burden on EPA;
  - The reasonableness and effectiveness of the Offeror's overall incentive strategy; and
  - The soundness of the Offeror's plan to update the QASP throughout the life of the project.
- The Offeror's demonstrated understanding of the FSMP objectives and EPA's business and technical environment;
- The thoroughness and realistic nature of the proposed implementation schedule (e.g., activities, durations, dependencies, resources);

- The thoroughness and effectiveness of the Offeror's proposed data migration and conversion strategy;
- The effectiveness and efficiency of the Offeror's technical approach for integrating the proposed components; and the approach for integrating the proposed components with non-FSMP systems (e.g., availability of pre-built integration adapters / connectors among components of solution and between solution and other applications);
- Overall effectiveness and efficiency of the Offeror's approach to move EPA from the current to the future state and the rationale to support the approach;
- The extent to which the Offeror's approach meets Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) Level 3 criteria. A copy of the most recent certification must be included in the response to the RFP. Other evidence may be provided, but will not have the weight of CMMI certification;
- The completeness and appropriateness of the portion of the Offeror's risk management plan applicable to implementation; and
- The validity and reasonableness of the Offeror's implementation assumptions.

For Hosting, the evaluation areas described in the first two (2) bullets below are each more important than any of the other remaining individual bullets under Hosting. EPA will evaluate:

- The Offeror's self-evaluation against the Financial Management Line of Business, Center of Excellence, Due Diligence Checklist;
- The completeness and appropriateness of the Offeror's proposed service level agreement;
- The Offeror's self assessment against the Tier III criteria established by the Uptime Institute® ;
- The Offeror's most recent Type II SAS 70 evaluation;
- The Offeror's self assessment against the security controls for moderate baseline systems as defined in NIST 800-53;
- The release management methodology of upgrades and patches provided by the software vendor;
- The completeness and appropriateness of the portion of the Offeror's risk management plan applicable to the proposed hosting solution;
- The completeness and appropriateness of the Continuity of Operations Plan;
- Documentation supporting successful Disaster Recovery Plan Testing; and
- The validity and reasonableness of the Offeror's hosting assumptions.

**Sub-Factor 1.B - Organizational Experience and Past Performance 94 Points**

The Offeror's Organizational Experience and Past Performance will be evaluated based on the offeror's discussion of its organizational experience and information obtained from the Offeror's references and from other sources.

Organizational Experience- EPA will evaluate the Offeror's corporate experience with commensurate public sector projects of similar size, scope and complexity. In addition, EPA will evaluate the Offeror's experience with the components of the proposed solution. EPA may contact references to verify experience regarding contractors, subcontractors, and staff.

Past Performance- EPA will evaluate Offeror's corporate and individual past performance including the relevance of the references provided in comparison to EPA's FSMP scope, size and complexity and whether the Offeror has provided references that meet all of the required categories as outlined in the Instructions to Offerors. Substantially greater weight will be given to past performance in engagements involving the key personnel being proposed for the FSMP.

EPA will evaluate Offeror's past performance as a measure of the degree to which an Offeror and its proposed sub contractors and key personnel have satisfied its customers to include:

- the quality and timeliness of the work;
- ability to estimate costs accurately and to control those cost to stay within budget;
- business behavior and commitment to customer satisfaction; and
- technical and management capabilities.

**Sub-Factor 1.C - Management Approach****56 Points**

Sub-Factor 1.C consists of Management Approach and Personnel.

The Offeror's Management Approach will be evaluated based on the following. The two (2) main bullets under Management Approach are listed in descending order of importance:

- The Offeror's ability to manage the project as evidenced by the adequacy of the detailed management and control plan/procedures proposed to include:
  - The thoroughness and reasonableness of the risk management approach and mitigation strategies;
  - The efficiency and effectiveness of the Offeror's Quality Control Plan to ensure quality and the achievement of FSMP objectives;
  - The extent to which the Offeror's Partnership strategy demonstrates an understanding of the required collaboration and communication mechanisms necessary to efficiently and effectively

manage the project;

-The extent to which the Offeror's staffing approach demonstrates an understanding of the resources necessary to support the overall FSMP solution and implementation. The reasonableness and suitability of the proposed mix of personnel (both in terms of labor categories and number of people) will be evaluated for realistic and appropriate nature.

-The Offeror's demonstration of its corporate commitment to the FSMP objectives by making the resulting contract a corporate priority;

-The Offeror's Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) - The QASP criteria associated with Project Management, will be evaluated under Management Approach in accordance with the following criteria;

- \* Offeror's inclusion of meaningful, applicable performance standards that address project management;

- \*The reasonableness of the Offeror's Acceptable Quality levels and the likelihood that they will provide incentive for the successful offeror to perform at a high level; and

- \*The reasonableness of the Offeror's proposed monitoring methods (including earned value management), including verifiability of the measures by EPA and a recommended approach that minimizes the burden on EPA.

-The validity and reasonableness of the management approach assumptions.

- The extent to which the Offeror's management approach demonstrates an understanding of the management complexities of the overall effort. Offerors will be evaluated on the quality and thoroughness of their management plan and how the supporting management structure will operate to meet the requirements of the contract.

EPA will evaluate the Offeror's proposed personnel to include:

- The extent to which the Offeror's identification of key and non-key personnel demonstrates an understanding of the EPA environment and is consistent with the proposed solution.
- Key Personnel and members of the proposed staff have experience in the implementation of the proposed solution;

- Key Personnel have the appropriate credentials (e.g. Project Manager is PMI-certified or equivalent). Equivalence should include education and experience equal to that required for PMI certification. See the PMI credentials handbook at: [http://www.pmi.org/info/PDC\\_PMPHandbook.pdf](http://www.pmi.org/info/PDC_PMPHandbook.pdf). Evidence of successful learning should be provided through successful completion of certificate exams by generally

recognized project management institutions or relevant degree from accredited institutions. Evidence of commitment to continuing education should also be provided.; and

-The proposed personnel are fully qualified to perform assigned functions based on their education, skills and experience.

- Proposed utilization of key personnel in performance of the effort; and
- The validity and reasonableness of the personnel assumptions.

Factor 2 - Oral Presentation and  
Solution Demonstration Evaluation (OP\SD)

**125 Points**

EPA will evaluate the OP\SD based on the Offeror's overall understanding of the FSMP, the composition and demonstration of skills of the Offeror's team, and the ability of the solution (as demonstrated) to meet critical EPA needs described in the business scenarios provided to the Offerors.

**Sub-Factor 2.A - Oral Presentation**

**25 Points**

The Oral Presentation accounts for 20% of the OP\SD score. The oral presentation will be evaluated based on the following elements:

- The extent to which the presentation demonstrates the Offeror's understanding of e-gov initiatives;
- The extent to which the presentation demonstrates the Offeror's understanding of the FSMP requirements; and
- The extent to which the presentation demonstrates the Offeror's knowledge, expertise and ability to satisfy the goals and objectives of FSMP.

**Sub-Factor 2.B - Solution Demonstration**

**100 Points**

The Solution Demonstration accounts for 80% of the OP\SD score. The Solution Demonstration will be conducted to evaluate how the Offeror's solution meets the functional and technical requirements of this solicitation, as defined in the business scenarios. In addition, the demonstration will provide input for validating the accuracy of the offeror's response to the requirements response matrix. The Solution Demonstration will be evaluated based on the following elements:

- The quality of and extent to which the solution demonstrates the business scenarios and the Offeror's understanding of the business objectives of these scenarios;
- The extent to which the solution reflects the Offeror's knowledge, expertise and ability to satisfy the goals and objectives of FSMP;
- Navigation and ease of use qualities; and

- The effectiveness and performance of the Offeror's team during the demonstration.

4. The attachment entitled "INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PREPARATION OF PROPOSALS" has been modified. The text is as follows:

THIS ATTACHMENT IS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE. THE FULL TEXT OF THE ATTACHMENT IS AVAILABLE ON THE EPA WEBSITE FOR THIS REQUIREMENT:

[http://www.epa.gov/oamhpod1/adm\\_placement/fsmp/index.htm](http://www.epa.gov/oamhpod1/adm_placement/fsmp/index.htm)

- **THIS ATTACHMENT IS REVISED UNDER AMENDMENT 1.** THE FULL TEXT OF THE REVISED ATTACHMENT IS AVAILABLE ON THE EPA WEBSITE FOR THIS REQUIREMENT:  
[http://www.epa.gov/oamhpod1/adm\\_placement/fsmp/index.htm](http://www.epa.gov/oamhpod1/adm_placement/fsmp/index.htm)

5. The attachment entitled "DUE DILIGENCE CHECKLIST" has been modified. The text is as follows:

THIS ATTACHMENT IS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE. THE FULL TEXT OF THE ATTACHMENT IS AVAILABLE ON THE EPA WEBSITE FOR THIS SOLICITATION:

[http://www.epa.gov/oamhpod1/adm\\_placement/fsmp/index.htm](http://www.epa.gov/oamhpod1/adm_placement/fsmp/index.htm)

- **THIS ATTACHMENT IS REVISED UNDER AMENDMENT 1.** THE FULL TEXT OF THE REVISED ATTACHMENT IS AVAILABLE ON THE EPA WEBSITE FOR THIS REQUIREMENT:  
[http://www.epa.gov/oamhpod1/adm\\_placement/fsmp/index.htm](http://www.epa.gov/oamhpod1/adm_placement/fsmp/index.htm)

6. The attachment entitled "QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS #1, DATED 02/09/2006" has been added. The text is as follows:

#### **PR-HQ-05-12521 Questions and Answers #1, dated 02/09/2006**

1. General question – May bidders assume the Government will make them aware of – and revision mark – updates and changes to the RFP and attachments via updates to the web site?

**ANSWER 1: Any updates to the RFP and attachments will be made by solicitation amendment. The amendment will identify any changes to the solicitation's terms or content.**

2. SF33 requires one original and 11 copies. Attachment 5, 1.1 Format for Written Technical and Price Proposal requires one original and 10 copies. Please clarify the number of copies required.

**ANSWER 2: The SF33 is corrected to require one original and 10 copies.**

3. RFP section C.3 states "The Contractor's technical proposal entitled, "TBD at time of award \_\_\_\_" dated \_\_\_\_, is incorporated by reference and made a part of this contract. In the event of any inconsistency between the provisions of this contract and the Contractor's technical proposal, the contract provisions take precedence." Will the Government establish an order of precedence among and between the contract's multiple



sections and attachments? For example, if a statement in the Section C Statement of Objectives conflicts with a statement in the Attachment J-4 Concept of Operations, which should the contractor regard as the governing document?

**ANSWER 3: The Government is unaware of any inconsistencies between the Statement of Objectives and Attachment 4, "Concept of Operations". Interested parties who believe a conflict exists which could materially affect the content of their proposal to the Government should identify these inconsistencies to the Government for consideration and possible amendment.**

4. (a) G.1 Government Furnished Property for FSMP describes office space to be provided. Attachment 5, page 15, 1.2.5.1 states that, "(d) For pricing and evaluation purposes, offerors shall assume that no Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) will be provided." Please confirm that the GFE consists of the 29 office spaces at the Government facility described in G.1 and Attachment 3.

**ANSWER 4(a): The GFE consists of the 29 office spaces at the Government facility described in G.1 and Attachment 3.**

(b) For pricing and evaluation purposes, is the Offeror to assume work is to be performed at the Government site and to use Government site rates, or should the Offeror assume that the work is to be performed at the Offeror's site and use Offeror's site rates?

**ANSWER 4(b): The offeror should propose what it believes to be the most efficient approach and prepare its price proposal based upon the approach proposed to meet the FSMP requirements. The Government will make the office space identified in Attachment 3 available to the successful offeror. On-site rates should be proposed for all effort performed at a Government facility.**

5. RFP section G.11 Subcontract Consent states "Consent is given to issue the following subcontracts: TBD at time of award". May bidders assume that the Contracting Officer will consent to the subcontractors identified in bidder's proposal?

**ANSWER 5: Offerors may assume that the subcontract consent clause will include either 1) consent for all subcontracts proposed or 2) consent for those subcontracts acceptable to the Government after evaluation of Final Proposal Revisions, if required.**

6. (a) RFP section G.11 Subcontract Consent states "The Contractor shall submit the information required by the "Subcontracts," clause to the Contracting Officer and assigned Project Officer. The Contracting Officer will provide written notice to the Contractor of his decision." Does "Subcontracts clause" mean FAR 52.244-2 Subcontracts (AUG 1998)?

**ANSWER 6(a): Yes.**

(b) Need a contractor with a government-approved purchasing system provide the information required therein?

**ANSWER 6(b): The clause at 52.244-2 is applicable to this contract. In accordance with paragraph (e) of the clause, a contractor with an approved purchasing system need obtain Contracting Officer consent to place subcontracts subsequent to award, if the CO has added any stipulations under the fill-in portion of paragraph (e). The Government has not included any stipulations under (e) for this solicitation.**

7. RFP section H.10 Earned Value Management. Does the Government agree that Earned Value Management is applicable only to firm fixed price task orders?

**ANSWER 7: No, the earned value management requirements apply to the entire contract effort, regardless of task order type.**

8. (a) RFP clauses H.17 Treatment Of Confidential Business Information (EPAAR 1552.235-71) (APR 1984), H.18 Release Of Contractor Confidential Business Information (EPAAR 1552.235-79) (APR 1996), H.19 Access To Confidential Business Information (EPAAR 1552.235-80) (OCT 2000) Deviation and L.15 Release Of Cost Or Pricing Proposals Outside The Government For Audit (EP 52.215-115) (MAR 1989): Disclosure of certain information (for example, hourly rates and the like) may, for obvious competitive reasons, be regarded as particularly sensitive. Do the disclosures contemplated by these clauses include such financial information?

**ANSWER 8(a): The Section H clauses referenced above refer to confidential business information which will be provided to the successful awardee during contract or IAG performance. Only provision L.15 refers to financial information of the offeror.**

(b) Does H.19 mean that the contractor whose information is to be disclosed will have an opportunity to review, comment, and/or redact the information proposed for disclosure prior to the Government doing so?

**ANSWER 8(b): H.19 means the awardee will not be provided with confidential business information unless and until the Government has taken the proper steps, including notification requirements, if applicable.**

9. H.21(b) states "(b) During the first twelve (12) months of contract performance, the Contractor shall make no substitutions of key personnel unless the substitution is necessitated by illness, death, or termination of employment. The Contractor shall notify the Contracting Officer within 15 calendar days after the occurrence of any of these events and provide the information required by paragraph (c) below. After the initial twelve (12) month period, the Contractor shall submit the information required by paragraph (c) to the Contracting Officer at least 15 calendar days prior to making any permanent substitutions." There are numerous circumstances in addition to those listed under which it may become necessary to replace key personnel. For example, a working spouse is transferred to a new city and the family moves to that city. Will the Government modify H.21(b) to read, "(b) During contract performance, the Contractor shall submit the information required by paragraph (c) to the Contracting Officer at least 15 calendar days prior to making any permanent substitutions, unless the substitution is

necessitated by illness, death, or termination of employment. The Contractor shall notify the Contracting Officer within 15 calendar days after the occurrence of any of these events and provide the information required by paragraph (c) below."

**ANSWER 9: No, the Government will not make the requested change. H.21 is a promulgated EPA Acquisition Regulation clause.**

10. RFP section I.9 and FAR clause 52.222-42: Section 4.113 of the Service Contract Act, as set forth in 29 CFR 541, is applicable to "service employees," a term defined as "Any Employee Employed In A Bona Fide Executive, Administrative, or Professional Capacity..." All of our employees for whom hourly fixed rates are applicable to this effort fall into one of these categories. Therefore, we request deletion of section I.9 and FAR clauses 52.222-41, 52.222-42, and 52.222-43.

**ANSWER 10: EPA believes the question is intended to read "...the Service Contract Act, as set forth in 29 CFR 541, is not applicable to..."any employee employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacity...". The Government has determined that the Service Contract Act applies to this acquisition. If, based upon the constitution of the labor categories being proposed by an offeror, all of that offeror's staff fall within an exception to the Service Contract Act, then the Act will not apply to their staff.**

11. L.12 General Financial And Organizational Information (EPAAR 1552.215-73) (AUG 1999): In which Volume should we place this information?

**ANSWER 11: Volume 6.**

12. L.12 states that (s) "Additionally, offerors shall submit current financial statements, including a Balance Sheet, Statement of Income (Loss), and Cash Flow for the last two completed fiscal years. Specify resources available to perform the contract without assistance from any outside source. If sufficient resources are not available, indicate in proposal the amount required and the anticipated source (i.e., bank loans, letter or lines of credit, etc.)." Such corporate information can be an extensive document, and an online version is often a preferred format. In the interest of reducing the amount of paper provided, may the Offeror respond to this requirement by including a URL to a web site containing the information?

**ANSWER 12: No.**

13. L.16, Page L-12, Definition Of Labor Classifications (EP 52.215-120) (FEB 1985) states "Offerors may propose labor categories other than those identified in Attachment 8, but they must show how company categories are mapped to the RFP categories." If the Offeror proposes new categories, they would not have a mapping to the RFP categories - they would be new. Does the Government mean that if the Offeror proposes new categories, the Offeror should include the functional and experience descriptions, as currently provided for the existing labor categories? If not, then please clarify what is meant by "show how company categories are mapped to the RFP categories".

**ANSWER 13: The Government wants to know under which company categories the knowledge, skills and abilities identified in the labor categories provided by the Government are met.**

14. Attachment 4 Concept of Operations, 2.1.6 Cost/Project Management states "OPPIN is a custom-built server application for detailed time tracking." Is time manually entered into OPPIN or is there an automated process, i.e., time clocks, Time Accounting System, etc.?

**ANSWER 14: As stated in Attachment 4, section 2.1.6, OPPIN "Cost information is obtained from IFMS and is supplemented by additional information entered by Pesticides personnel."**

15. Attachment 4 Concept of Operations, 2.1.6 Cost/Project Management states "CERCLIS enables managers to perform analysis and decision-making activities." Please define the analysis and decision-making activities supported by CERCLIS.

**ANSWER 15: CERCLIS combines resource information with programmatic information, e.g., schedules, and completion dates. This fusion of data provides program managers with relevant information to manage the Superfund program.**

16. Attachment 4 Concept of Operations, 3.1.7 Property Management states "Contract purchases are performed in ICMS which does not interface to IFMS." Is goods receipt performed in ICMS for contract purchases? If not, please identify the application where goods receipt is performed.

**ANSWER 16: No. Goods receipt is a manual process.**

17. Attachment 4 Concept of Operations, Appendix B, B.5 CPS Description states "Web Invoice System (WIS) is used for electronic invoice receipt from laboratories."  
 (a) Are the laboratories EPA entities or external to EPA?  
 (b) If EPA entities, can they manually enter invoices into the proposed FSMP system?  
 (c) What volume of electronic invoices is received through WIS?

**ANSWER 17(a) They are external to EPA**

**ANSWER 17(b) N/A**

**ANSWER 17(c) Approximately 460 invoices per month.**

18. Attachment 5 Instructions For The Preparation Of Proposals 1.2.5 Volume 5 - Price Proposal: When calculating the total software costs, will EPA allow vendors to credit existing application and/or database licensing owned by EPA towards that cost?

**ANSWER 18: No.**

19. Attachment 5 Instructions For The Preparation Of Proposals, page 17, 1.2.5.6, Supporting Cost states "(a) Direct Labor (i): Offerors shall submit a direct labor schedule, showing the calculations of direct labor dollars for each PWS task area per twelve month period, as well as the derivation of the fixed rates to be included in Attachment 9." Please clarify this instruction. Would summary hours multiplied by composite

rate for each annual PWS task area satisfy this requirement?

**ANSWER 19: No. Use the labor categories included in Attachment 9, not a composite rate.**

20. Attachment 5, pg. 16, Section 1.2.5.5 Cost/Price Schedules, below item (b) states "For the areas indicated in (i) through (iv) below". No item (iv) is listed. Is this an error or omission?

**ANSWER 20: Yes, this is an error. The statement is amended to read "For the areas indicated in (i) through (iii) below."**

21. Attachment 5 Instructions For The Preparation Of Proposals 1.2.5 Volume 5 - Price Proposal: Outside of databases and technology tools like portals, is EPA running any actual Oracle applications (not including acquired applications like Peoplesoft)?

**ANSWER 21: Section 2, especially table 2.4, of attachment 4 to the solicitation (Concept of Operations) specifies the databases, operating systems, and software engineering products in use by OCFO for the business areas within scope of FSMP.**

22. Attachment 5 Instructions For The Preparation Of Proposals 1.2.2 Volume 2 - Software Solution: Will EPA assess the risk that large-scale corporate acquisition or merger activity may present in terms of technology development and software stability of the software vendors being evaluated in the technical evaluation or as part of the risk management plan?

**ANSWER 22: The technology development and software product stability risk will be evaluated in the technical merit section as described in Provision M.5, Sub-Factor 1.A.**

23. Attachment 5 Instructions For The Preparation Of Proposals 1.2.2.2 General Software Information: Will EPA, as part of their evaluation, specifically assess the level of dependency solutions have with third-party tools and assess the corporate viability of that third-party technology?

**ANSWER 23: This is adequately addressed in the proposal instructions; see especially the requirements response matrices. Part M.5, Evaluation Factors for award, lists the factors EPA will consider when evaluating the software solution.**

24. Attachment 7 Requirements Response Matrices Requirement BFM-EPA-017 states "Maintain estimates that exceed targets and specified constraints as separate entities from the main budget field at all levels." What is meant by "separate entities"?

**ANSWER 24: A separate entity is a distinct field or overlay from the budget. It's the ability to add or subtract the entity as a whole.**

25. Attachment 7 Requirements Response Matrices Requirement BFM-EPA-025 states "Apply over-target or under-target factors to specified budget values." What is meant by "apply... factors to... budget values"? Does this

mean there should be limits to what can be entered for line item values, or something else?

**ANSWER 25: Applying identified budget increases or decreases to specific budget line items. No it does not mean limits on what can be entered.**

26. Attachment 7 Requirements Response Matrices Requirement BFM-EPA-229 states "Ability to capture and maintain the bidding and negotiation process for Regions, States, and tribes to arrive at commitment targets for the FY." Please explain the bidding and negotiation process.

**ANSWER 26: The bidding process assists National Program Managers and Regional managers in negotiating and agreeing on annual regional performance commitments. The bidding process captures key program measures identified in National Program Guidance documents and is used to facilitate agreement on the final annual regional commitments that are made against each measure.**

27. (a) Attachment 7 Requirements Response Matrices Requirements BFM-EPA-026 and BFM-EPA-081 state "Selectively identify over-target or under-target values and generate a separate version of an existing budget if approved." What is meant by "generate a separate version"?

**ANSWER 27(a) : A separate version is simply that - a separate and distinct version of the complete budget.**

(b) Should this version just include items that are outside of targets?

**ANSWER 7(b) : No.**

28. Attachment 7 Requirements Response Matrices Requirement BFM-EPA-111 states "Ability to create/maintain APG baseline and universe data." What is "universe data"?

**ANSWER 28: Universe data represents the total data available about a particular measure, e.g., in measuring underground storage tanks, the universe is total underground storage tanks.**

29. Attachment 7 Requirements Response Matrices Requirement PAY-EPA-186 states "Provide the status of each payment so that a payment can be identified as having been sent or returned to Treasury." What does "returned to Treasury" mean?

**ANSWER 29: "Returned to Treasury" means the return of a Treasury payment because of an error, such as, an incorrect bank routing number. The payment is held until the Agency directs Treasury to reissue the payment.**

30. Attachment 7 Requirements Response Matrices Requirement TECH - TRB-EPA-011: What is the earliest version of the Oracle Database that needs to be supported for this procurement? (Oracle 7.3.x, 8i, 9i, etc.)

**ANSWER 30: The earliest version that needs to be supported is Oracle Database version 9i.**

31. Attachment 7 Requirements Response Matrices Requirement TECH - TRE-EPA-010: Will the EPA standardize on a single LDAP server or will multiple servers continue to be supported?

**ANSWER 31: EPA currently plans to migrate to a standardized LDAP server in approximately 1 -2 years.**

32. Attachment 7 Requirements Response Matrices Requirement TECH - TRA-EPA-008: Could the EPA clarify Vendor Independent Message standards and for what purpose does the EPA use them (perhaps with an example)?

**ANSWER 32: Vendor Independent Messaging (VIM) is a JFMIP value added requirement that supports workflow and messaging. The JFMIP defines VIM as:**

**"An application-programming interface (API) that allows the exchange of electronic mail among programs from different vendors. Members of the VIM Consortium are in the process of internally standardizing on VIM across all their networking products as they roll out their new product releases. VIM is designed to work across desktop platforms on Windows, Macintosh, DOS and OS/2."**

**The definition can be accessed by the following link:**

**[http://www.jfmip.gov/jfmip/download/document/core\\_system\\_requirements.pdf#search='jfmip%20vim'](http://www.jfmip.gov/jfmip/download/document/core_system_requirements.pdf#search='jfmip%20vim')**

33. (a) Attachment 7 Requirements Response Matrices Requirement TECH - TRB-EPA-013: Does the EPA utilize a standard Data Warehouse or does it use multiple vendors and tools?

**ANSWER 33(a): Multiple vendors and tools.**

(b) If multiple, could the EPA please provide a list of Data Warehouse products currently used?

**ANSWER 33(b): The tools which have been adopted are specified in Attachment A page C-9 of 16**

34. Attachment 7 Requirements Response Matrices Requirement BXC-EPA-130 states: "Include in addition to the reprogramming (purpose/justification statements), a minimum of two additional comment and two numeric fields (requiring reference validation) that can be reported on, but not include as part of the movement of funds (i.e. not part of the budget)." Can you provide more detail on the "reference validation"? What are the "numeric fields"? Is the reference in the financial system or an external system reference?

**ANSWER 34: The reference validation represents a system validation of the values entered. The Agency accounts for but does not execute at an Agency level the additional numeric fields. The reference is in the financial system.**

35. Attachment 7 Requirements Response Matrices Requirement BXC-EPA-042

states "Provide the ability to specify and use additional control fields in transactions to simplify the reconciliation of commitments and obligations on credit-card purchases, travel transactions, contracts, assistance agreements, IAGs, IPAs, etc." Can you provide examples of the "additional control fields"?

**ANSWER 35: Additional control fields can be EPA's Site/Project Field, Responsibility Center, or the Cost/Organization field.**

36. Attachment 16 - Solution Demonstration-Business Scenarios: Does EPA intend to specifically validate if a vendor's software truly does real-time updates (versus if the vendor's software just schedules batch processes to occur frequently)?

**ANSWER 36: EPA has specified its business scenarios and expects to see the scenarios demonstrated as stated.**

37. Demo Scenario 4.2.2 states "No control - System does not prohibit entry of spending documents. System automatically creates funding data based on spending transaction." What is meant by "automatically creates funding data"? Where should funding come from?

**ANSWER 37: Automatically creates funding data means the system automatically populates the funding information from the higher budgetary control levels. If no budget line exists, the system should create a budget line and the available dollars would become negative.**

38. Demo scenario - general: The demo scripts are very specific. If there are cases where the most effective way to process the business requirement in the COTS software varies somewhat from the description in the scenario, but achieves the same result, is it acceptable to vary from the script description?

**ANSWER 38: EPA considers the scripts to be results oriented, not process descriptions. EPA will evaluate the demonstrations and the results identified in the scripts.**

39. Demo Scenario - general: EPA has identified the legacy systems it anticipates will be replaced by the FSMP. If a bidder's solution includes leaving any of these legacy systems in place (i.e., proposes to not replace a system but rather incorporate it in the FSMP solution), how should the bidder answer items in the requirements matrix that are met by the legacy system? How should the bidder address demo scenarios that involve the functionality of the legacy system?

**ANSWER 39: The Concept of Operations identifies three business areas for which the FSMP solution must meet EPA's business and technical requirements. These are:**

- **Core Financial Management (General Ledger, Budget Execution, Payment Management, Receivable Management, and Cost/Project Management)**
- **Strategic Plan Management and Budget Formulation**
- **Property Management**



*EPA has provided legacy system response matrices for the non-core financial management areas. The core financial software must be JFMIP certified. EPA expects the legacy core accounting system (IFMS) to be replaced by a JFMIP certified product. EPA will provide its assessment of the extent to which EPA's legacy applications satisfy non-JFMIP mandatory requirements in core financial management areas. Effective the date of this amendment, the information is posted at: <http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/modernization/index.htm>. Offerors should use the EPA responses to complete their response matrix for requirements proposed to be met by legacy systems.*

*Please see Attachment 5, Section 1.3.3. for instructions on how to address demo scenarios that involve the functionality of a legacy system.*

40. Demo scenario - general: May the offerors include a brief introduction of how each solution works before beginning each scripted demo?

**ANSWER 40: Yes. Please see Attachment 5, 1.3.5, for the complete requirements.**

41. We have found that it is helpful for the Government to hold confidential one-on-one sessions with prospective prime offerors after release of the RFP. These sessions enable the offerors to discuss the RFP and their approaches to it in a confidential manner, and are particularly useful where a new concept such as LOBs and Commercial Centers of Excellence are being implemented for the first time. This approach limits demands on EPA staff since these sessions are limited to potential prime offerors who assert that they will meet the requirements of the downselect matrix. We suggest a two hour time limit on these sessions, and that they be conducted immediately after submission of questions on January 26, 2006.

**ANSWER 41: In accordance with FAR 15.201(f), "When a presolicitation or preproposal conference is conducted, materials distributed at the conference should be made available to all potential offerors, upon request." Based upon this guidance, the Government has determined that one-on-one conferences after release of the solicitation will not be held in order to maintain the integrity of the acquisition process. Potential offerors must submit their questions in writing. To the extent that the potential offeror believes public dissemination of the question being submitted will reveal a confidential business strategy, they should append the appropriate legend per FAR 3.104-5 and 52.215-1(e). The Contracting Officer will follow the guidance at 3.104-5 when making the final determination regarding the proprietary nature of information submitted.**

42. Attachment 7 Requirements Response Matrices Requirement PAY-EPA-287 states "Automatically include additional relevant identification information such as Invoice amount and Payment amount." Where should this information be included?

**ANSWER 42: The information should be included on remittances.**

43. Attachment 7 Requirements Response Matrices Strategic Planning and Budget Formulation: Strategic Planning has not been part of the JFMIP certification test cycles so far. How does column 2 apply? How should we answer this?

**ANSWER 43: This is adequately addressed in the instructions. Please see the instructions for column 2 in the Instructions tab of the requirements response matrix.**

44. RFP, Attachment 5, Page 7, Tab B Technical and Functional Methodology states "The Offeror shall propose a task structure that, at a minimum, addresses the following discreet tasks: Project Management, Product Familiarization Approach, Implementation Approach, Approach to Integration/Interfaces, Product Acceptance Test, Data Migration/Conversion Strategy, Approach to Testing, Change Management Approach, and Approach to Hosting."

RFP, Attachment 6, Page 16, 1.2.5.5, Cost / Price Schedules states "(ii) Implementation- Provide within the implementation pricing table discreet pricing for each interface proposed in the software solution."

It seems more appropriate to include interface pricing under the task for "Approach to Integration/ Interfaces", rather than the task "Implementation Approach". Please confirm where interface pricing is to be provided.

**ANSWER 44: We agree. Attachment 5 is amended to allow interface pricing to be placed under the task "Approach to Integration/Interfaces."**

45. H.11 Option to Extend the Effective Period of the Contract—Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity Contract (EPAAR 1552.217-76) (APR 1984) describes five one-year option periods. I.7 Option to Extend Services (FAR 52.217-8) (NOV 1999) says, "The option provision may be exercised more than once, but the total extension of performance hereunder shall not exceed 6 months." I.7 seems unnecessary. Please delete I.7 or explain its meaning in the context of H.11.

**ANSWER 45: The Option to Extend Services clause does not specify option periods, but rather it specifies the terms under which the Government may require continued performance under an existing period of the contract at the rates specified in the contract. An example of when this option might be exercised would be if the contract were scheduled to expire on August 31, 2016, but a replacement contract had not yet been awarded. The Government could, under this option to extend services, require the incumbent contractor to continue performance for an additional six (6) months at the rates specified in the contract for the final period of performance.**

46. General: What is the Government's anticipated date of award of a contract resulting from this RFP?

**ANSWER 46: See Provision L.2 of the solicitation**

47. General: For what length of time from the due date does the Government

desire bidder's proposals to remain valid?

**ANSWER 47: See block 12 of the Standard Form 33. Under Amendment 0001, EPA revises the validity period from 180 days to 240 days.**

48. C.1 Financial System Modernization Project Statement Of Objectives; section 1.3.1 FSMP Strategic Goals states "To deliver a world-class, best value, business and financial enterprise to EPA, the FSMP should address the following strategic goals: Implement an Agency-wide resource management solution for the primary FSMP business areas; Increase efficiency and effectiveness by optimizing investments; Embrace and expand current initiatives; and Identify measurement benchmarks and exceed industry performance standards." Please clarify what "Implement an Agency-wide resource management solution for the primary FSMP business areas" means. Is HR in scope?

**ANSWER 48: This is adequately addressed in the instructions. Please see C.1 Financial System Modernization Project Statement of Objectives; section 1.2.**

49. Example #1 - from EPA's FinRS RFP, Section C  
SECTION C - DESCRIPTION/SPECIFICATIONS/WORK STATEMENT  
Section C 1.2.1 of EPA's RFP titled, FSMP Business Areas (as copied below) from page C-1 of 16

"The FSMP business areas for which the FSMP solution must meet EPA's business and technical requirements include:  
Core Financial Management (General Ledger, Budget Execution, Payment Management, Receivable Management, and Cost/Project Management)  
Strategic Plan Management and Budget Formulation  
Property Management"

(a) Will responses that do not propose a specific and detailed solution to the FSMP requirement for Strategic Plan Management & Budget Formulation be considered for award or be at a competitive disadvantage to offerors that do?

**ANSWER 49(a): Attachment 5, Instructions for the Preparation of Proposals, Section 1.2.2.2, General Software Information specifies: "EPA anticipates that each offeror will provide a total solution, addressing all functional areas listed in the CONOPS, located in Attachment 4. The solution may include Vendor-Owned, Third Party, or EPA legacy applications." Evaluation factors and significant subfactors to determine the quality of products and services proposed are specified in provision M.5, Evaluation Factors for Award. The EPA will evaluate all responsive offers in accordance with provision M.5.**

(b) Will proposals from vendors who choose not to team with other prospective offerors be considered for partial award by EPA (or be joined with another team to augment their solution). For example, can a vendor submit a partial response and compete for a single component of EPA's FinRS RFP (i.e. Strategic Plan Management and Budget Formulation)?

**ANSWER 49(b): No. Attachment 5, Instructions for the Preparation of**

**Proposals, Section 1.2.2.2, General Software Information specifies:**

**"EPA anticipates that each offeror will provide a total solution, addressing all functional areas listed in the CONOPS, located in Attachment 4. The solution may include Vendor-Owned, Third Party, or EPA legacy applications." Evaluation factors and significant subfactors to determine the quality of products and services proposed are specified in provision M.5, Evaluation Factors for Award. The EPA will evaluate all responsive offers in accordance with provision M.5.**

50. Example #2 - from Attachment #5 to EPA's FinRS RFP, Section 1.2.2.1  
Section # 1.2.2.1 Requirements Response Matrices (from page 3 of Attachment #5)  
"Volume 2 shall include the completed Requirements Response Matrices. Please refer to the Requirements Response Matrices which are located in Attachment 7 (copied below) to the solicitation for detailed completion instructions requirements."  
Attachment #7, EPA's RFP titled: Requirement Response Matrices within the tab titled, Strategic Plan Management & Budget Formulation. Within this document & tab, EPA lists 186 specific requirements that must be addressed by the Strategic Plan Management & Budget Formulation component of the offerors solution.

Will responses that do not address these 186 requirements with a specific and detailed solution be considered for award or be at a competitive disadvantage to offerors that do?

**ANSWER 50: Attachment 5, Instructions for the Preparation of Proposals, Section 1.2.2.2, General Software Information specifies:**

**"EPA anticipates that each offeror will provide a total solution, addressing all functional areas listed in the CONOPS, located in Attachment 4. The solution may include Vendor-Owned, Third Party, or EPA legacy applications." Evaluation factors and significant subfactors to determine the quality of products and services proposed are specified in provision M.5, Evaluation Factors for Award. The EPA will evaluate all responsive offers in accordance with provision M.5.**

51. Example #3 - from Attachment #5 of EPA's FinRS RFP, Section 1.2.2.2  
Section 1.2.2.2 General Software Information (from page 4)  
"EPA anticipates that each offeror will provide a total solution, addressing all functional areas listed in the CONOPS, located in Attachment 4. The solution may include Vendor-Owned, Third Party, or EPA legacy applications."

Will responses that do not fully address all aspects of Table 1 (on page 4) with a specific and detailed solution be considered for award or be at a competitive disadvantage to offerors that do?

**ANSWER 51: Attachment 5, Instructions for the Preparation of Proposals, Section 1.2.2.2, General Software Information specifies:**

**"EPA anticipates that each offeror will provide a total solution, addressing all functional areas listed in the CONOPS, located in Attachment 4. The solution may include Vendor-Owned, Third Party, or EPA legacy applications." Evaluation factors and significant subfactors to determine the quality of products and services proposed are specified**

**in provision M.5, Evaluation Factors for Award. The EPA will evaluate all responsive offers in accordance with provision M.5.**

52. Example #4 - from Attachment #5 section #1.1  
Section 1.1 Solution Demonstration  
EPA has identified eight topic areas to be addressed in the solution demonstration portion of the OP\SD. The topic areas are:

- System and Technical Overview
- General Ledger
- Strategic Plan Management and Budget Formulation
- Budget Execution
- Payment Management
- Receivable Management
- Cost/Project Management
- Property Management

Will responses that do not provide a detailed demonstration of their proposed Strategic Plan Management and Budget Formulation solution be considered for award or be at a competitive disadvantage to offerors that do?

**ANSWER 52: Attachment 5, Instructions for the Preparation of Proposals, Section 1.2.2.2, General Software Information specifies: "EPA anticipates that each offeror will provide a total solution, addressing all functional areas listed in the CONOPS, located in Attachment 4. The solution may include Vendor-Owned, Third Party, or EPA legacy applications." Evaluation factors and significant subfactors to determine the quality of products and services proposed are specified in provision M.5, Evaluation Factors for Award. The EPA will evaluate all responsive offers in accordance with provision M.5.**

53. The Financial Systems Integration Office (FSIO) within the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) recently updated the core financial-system requirements that agencies must fulfill to meet federal guidelines to better manage their programs under the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act. Now that the FSIO requirements are final, will EPA publish a new requirements matrix? If a new matrix is published, will the deadline for proposal responses be extended?

**ANSWER 53: No. EPA will not publish new requirements.**

54. The period of performance is in two places in the RFP materials. In the Solicitation it is listed on page C-6 as 2 base years and 8 one year options, and in Attachment 5 Section 1.2.5.4, pages 15-16, the period of performance is listed as 5 base years and 5 one year options. Please clarify.

**ANSWER 54: Page C-6 of the solicitation specifies a maximum potential period of performance of ten (10) years. The Base Period specified in Clause F.4 is five (5) years. The Clause at H.11 specifies five option periods, each with a one-year duration.**

55. Section L.19 page L-13 states "As part of the initial offer, offerors shall submit a subcontracting plan as called for by FAR 52.219-9. The Offeror shall provide its Subcontracting Plan as Appendix A to Volume

Three."

(a) We assume this appendix does not count toward the page limit for Volume 3. Please confirm.

**ANSWER 55(a): The offeror's subcontracting plan does not count towards the page limitation on Volume 3.**

(b) Subcontracting plans contain information regarding work (expressed in dollars) committed to subcontractors. Please confirm that this information should be included in this plan and in this volume.

**ANSWER 55(b): The solicitation is amended to require the offeror's subcontracting plan to be included in Volume 6 of their proposal. Offerors should include all information required in clause 52.219-9.**

56. Attachment 2 provides examples and instructions for invoices that are cost reimbursement contracts and fixed rate contracts. This RFP anticipates the issuance of Task Order types which are firm fixed price, labor hour, or time and materials. Can you please clarify or provide applicable examples and instructions?

**ANSWER 56: Labor hour and time and materials contracts are both considered to be fixed-rate contracts for the purposes of this attachment. The awardee will provide the information required in the section entitled, "Supporting Schedule for Fixed-Rate Contracts" when invoicing for labor hour or time and materials task orders issued under the contract.**

57. Approach to Hosting, page 9, lists a variety of things the Offeror should describe such as approach to hosting, descriptions of reliability, scalability, approach to maintenance and operations, etc. However, only a few of these things are listed in the hosting evaluation criteria on page M-4 of the Solicitation. We assume this was an oversight, and the material that is requested from Offerors will be evaluated. Please confirm.

**ANSWER 57: All information requested in the Approach to Hosting section of the Instructions for the Preparation of Proposals will be evaluated by the Government, under the criteria identified in provision M.5 of the solicitation. As an example, "scalability" is addressed in question 12 of the Due Diligence Checklist, which is part of the first bullet under hosting (page M-4 of 9) in provision M.5.**

58. Approach to Hosting, page 9, states "The Offeror shall provide computing performance metrics for platforms and system environments that the application is certified to run on." We assume you would like performance metrics only for the proposed solution platforms and system environments. Please clarify.

**ANSWER 58: Yes. At a minimum, the Offeror shall provide computing performance metrics for platforms and system environments that the application is certified to run on. The Offeror is encouraged to include such other metrics it feels are appropriate.**

59. Section 1.2.3. Volume 3: Tab D Management Approach, page 13, paragraph 3; a matrix is requested that is a summary of hours by major tasks. For tasks or activities that are firm fixed price, LOE designations are not applicable. Please clarify how to reflect this in the matrix.

**ANSWER 59:** *As called for in Tab D, Management Approach, Offerors are to provide "a matrix that provides the major tasks (at a level of detail at least one level below the highest level described in the instructions for Tab B) across the top of the matrix and the following as rows: each organizational element of the proposing team; within each element, the labor categories proposed, ordered by labor rate highest to lowest; a row for EPA staff; a row for EPA PMO contract support; a row or rows for any other resources anticipated for the successful completion of the project." This instruction applies to all work proposed, even if the work is proposed under a fixed price arrangement. The Government requires this information in order to assess the offeror's understanding of the effort required for successful performance as well as the reasonableness of the offeror's approach and staffing assumptions.*

60. Section 1.2.3. Volume 3: Tab D Management Approach, requires documents such as letters of commitments and key personnel certification. We assume these types of documents are attachments and do not count toward the page limit. Please confirm.

**ANSWER 60:** *The solicitation is amended to require key personnel certifications and letter of commitment for subcontractors to be included in Volume 4, Supporting Documentation.*

61. Section 1.2.4 Volume 4, page 14, Supporting Documentation, requires a copy of the Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) to be submitted. An organization's COOP contains highly sensitive information, and it is not our policy to release such information. We would suggest dropping the requirement for submission and asking offerors to make their COOP available for review during the OP\SD.

**ANSWER 61:** *The solicitation is amended to require offerors to provide, at a minimum, a description of how their COOP meets the recommended elements for COOPs as set forth in NIST publication 800-34.*

62. Section 1.3.4 Oral Presentation: page 24, states "The offeror may not bring any reference or resource materials to the presentation." We assume this refers to software manuals and documentation and does not preclude presenters from using talking points. Please confirm.

**ANSWER 62:** *Yes, presenters may use talking points during the OP/SD.*

63. Section 1.3 describes how EPA will contact Offerors to establish a date and time for the OP\SD. "Presentations will be scheduled with Offerors as soon as possible after the closing date for receipt of proposals." We assume this means EPA will call offerors just after the closing date to schedule OP\SDs in the coming weeks. And we assume that EPA will require a minimum of three weeks after the receipt of proposals before beginning the OP\SDs. Please clarify.

**ANSWER 63: There is no minimum period between the closing date for receipt of proposals and the beginning of OP/SDs.**

64. In the Instructions to Offerors, Section 1.3.2 provides a page limitation of 145 pages for Volume 3, not to include "past performance references." Section 1.4.3, page 12, describes page limitations for Tab C Organizational Experience and Past Performance, which is within Volume 3.

(a) On page 12, a maximum of 5 pages is allocated to Organizational Experience. We assume this 5 page designation is in addition to the 145 pages.

**ANSWER 64(a): No. The (5) pages allotted to Organizational Experience are included in the 145 page limitation for Volume 3.**

(b) The Past Performance Information section requested would include descriptions of how the project meets the criteria as well as providing the client references. Is the full response to the Past Performance Information section outside of the page limitations?

**ANSWER 64(b): Yes**

65. Question 8. "Do the proposed Key Personnel have experience in implementing the proposed core financial management software in an organization of similar size and scope to EPA?" To qualify for a "Yes" we assume that some but not all of the 4 required Key Personnel must have this experience. Please confirm.

**ANSWER 65: Your assumption is incorrect. All key personnel are to have experience in implementing the proposed core financial management software in an organization of similar size and scope to EPA.**

66. Question regarding the down select matrix question # 6: Since the 800-53 is in draft form, we are waiting for the draft to become final and conduct an evaluation to examine our compliance status. Since 800-26 is the current regulation, can EPA re-word down-select question #6 to "The offeror meets minimum security controls for moderate baseline systems as defined in NIST 800-26 <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/nistpubs/800-53/800-53-annex2.pdf>".

**ANSWER 66: NIST's Special Publications website <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/nistpubs/index.html> now (February 9, 2006) shows that 800-53, Recommended Security Controls for Federal Information Systems, is final. Annex 2 to 800-53 has been final since June 2005. The requirement in the Minimum Qualifications Matrix, Attachment 6 to the Solicitation "The offeror meets minimum security controls for moderate baseline systems as defined in NIST 80-53 <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/nistpubs/800-53/800-53-annex2.pdf>" is intended to help ensure that EPA complies with minimum government-wide security requirements. EPA will not reword this question.**



PR-HQ-05-12521/0001